



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,386	10/05/2001	Michael Loren Lamb	SJ09-2001-0037	5127

33224 7590 05/17/2005

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
5600 COTTLE ROAD, DEPT. L2PA/010
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
SAN JOSE, CA 95193-0001

EXAMINER

WU, QING YUAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/972,386

Applicant(s)

LAMB ET AL.

Examiner

Qing-Yuan Wu

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/18/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/25/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following claim language is indefinite:

- i. As per claim 1, it is uncertain whether “a class driver” in line 6 refers to “a class driver,” in line 4; and whether “a storage devices” in line 6, refers to “one or more storage devices” in line 2 and “the storage devices” in line 5. In addition, it is uncertain if the “one or more storage devices” are internal or external to the digital data processors (i.e. if they are the same then “said” or “the” should be used and “the class driver” and “the storage devices” must be used throughout all the claims. Is the “one or more storage devices” a local disk to the one or more digital data processors?).

- ii. As per claims 10, 15 and 20, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.
- iii. As per claims 9 and 21, it is uncertain what applicant means by "the filter responds to identification of a storage device for which claiming is not to be blocked -- for which storage device claiming had previously been blocked --" (i.e. is the blocking/unblocking or masking/unmasking status of a storage device changing at the moment?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. PG Pub 20020069245), in view of Blumenau et al (hereafter Blumenau) (U.S. Patent 6,810,396).
6. As to claim 1, Kim teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a storage area network (SAN) comprising one or more digital data processors in communication with one or more storage devices, wherein at least a selected one of the digital data processors operates under an operating system having

Art Unit: 2194

a port driver defining a software interface between a class driver and an adapter to which one or more of the storage devices are coupled [pg. 7, paragraphs 107-108, and paragraph 110, lines 7-10; Pg. 10-11, paragraphs 135-143],

a class driver for claiming a storage devices for access by the operating system and any applications programs executing therein by invoking the port driver to which such device is coupled [pg. 4, paragraph 76; pg. 8, paragraphs 119-120; pg. 10, paragraph 134; Fig. 23],

7. Kim does not specifically teach a filter in communication with the port driver and the class driver, the filter intervening to block claiming of one or more selected storage devices by the class driver. However, Kim disclosed a filter program for access control, access share, and access right transfer, etc. [pg. 6, paragraph 94] and a class driver in communication with a port driver for passing requests from host to storage device [pg. 11, paragraph 143]. In addition, Blumenau teaches a filter/adapter unit that performs filtering function to ensure that only hosts with privileges are able to access the volume and filtering out non-privileged requests [Blumenau, col. 4, lines 60-65; col. 5, lines 10-16].

8. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching Kim with the teaching of Blumenau because both Kim and Blumenau teaches network storage access [pg. 1, paragraph 7; Blumenau, col. 1, lines 25-45].

9. As to claim 2, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the filter blocks claiming of a selected storage device by returning a failure code to the class driver in response to its invocation of the port driver for purposes of claiming that storage device [Blumenau, col. 16, lines 41-44]. Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the operating system is a Windows NT, however Kim as modified disclosed that a host may run in UNIX or Windows family of operating systems [pg. 1, paragraph 16, lines 7-8]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that Windows family of operating systems would have include Windows NT.

10. As to claim 3, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the operating system is a Windows 2000 [pg. 6, paragraph 104]. Kim as modified does not specifically teach the filter blocks claiming of a selected storage device by any of (i) intercepting a request from the class driver to the port driver for purposes of claiming that storage device, (ii) returning a failure code in response to such request. However, Kim as modified disclosed returning an error message to a requesting host when the request was blocked [Blumenau, col. 16, lines 41-44]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that un-privilege requests for the storage device would be blocked regardless of where the request was intercepted.

11. As to claim 4, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including comprising an element in communication with the filter and transmitting thereto identifiers of

Art Unit: 2194

one or more storage devices for which claiming is to be any of blocked and not blocked

[Blumenau, col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, lines 34-38].

12. As to claim 5, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.

13. As to claim 6, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the element transmits to the filter identifiers of one or more storage devices for which claiming is not to be blocked, the filter intervening to block claiming of fiber channel storage devices other than those identified for which claiming is not to be blocked [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16].

14. As to claims 7-8, Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the class driver creates a disk object upon successfully claiming a storage device. However, Kim as modified disclosed a bus driver and port driver creating device objects in which the device objects help software manage hardware [pg. 7, paragraph 108, lines 6-9 and paragraph 112, lines 1-9; pg. 10, paragraph 135; Fig. 22]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized the advantage of creating software objects and to better manage the storage devices using these objects by a software as been considered by Kim as modified.

15. As to claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 3. In addition,

Art Unit: 2194

Kim as modified does not specifically teach the filter responds to identification of a storage device for which claiming is not to be blocked -- for which storage device claiming had previously been blocked -- by invoking the port driver for purposes of claiming the one or more storage devices identified by the port driver as being coupled to the selected digital data processor. However, Kim as modified disclosed providing access to privileged requests and blocking out non-privileged request as indicated by information in a volume configuration management database, and a management console for updating the information [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the status of the storage devices could be updated as been considered by Kim as modified.

16. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 2 and 4 above.

17. As to claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 10 above.

18. As to claim 12, Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the manager digital data processor is coupled to the selected digital data processors by a second network. However, Kim as modified disclosed a management console having access to update information of the volume configuration management database [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the manager digital processor could communicate and update information/criteria for filtering regardless of its location.

19. As to claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 12 above. In addition, Kim as modified teaches wherein the first network comprises fiber channel [Blumenau, 14, Fig. 1].

20. As to claim 14, Kim as modified does not specifically teach a graphical user interface. However, Kim as modified disclosed system administrator/a management console having access to update information of the volume configuration management database [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that an interface has to be present in order for the information to be enter by the system administrator or by the system administrator through the use of the management console.

21. As to claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 3, 6 and 10 above.

22. As to claims 16-19, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 11-14 above.

23. As to claim 20, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 4, and 15 above. Kim as modified does not specifically teach a plug-n-play manager that invokes the port driver to populate a data structure with data pertaining to one or more storage devices that are coupled the adapter, and the filter block access to selected ones of the storage devices by removing from the data structure at least selected data pertaining those storage devices. However, Kim as modified

Art Unit: 2194

disclosed generating a filter table with data pertaining to one or more storage devices that are coupled the adapter [Blumenau, col. 4, lines 60-62], and providing access to privileged requests and blocking out non-privileged request as indicated by information in a volume configuration management database, setting and unsetting a bitmask to indicate accessibility of a storage devices [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have include the invoking of the port driver because the port driver is bridge between the class driver and storage devices and responsible for adding and removing the storage devices (i.e. create/remove device object) [pgs. 10-11, paragraphs 134-141], and controlling the access of the storage devices by indicating the availability/accessibility of the storage devices.

24. As to claim 21, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 9 and 20 above.


25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2194

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194